DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 331 HE 028 919

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Burn, Barbara B.; Smuckler, Ralph H. |
| TITLE | A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States. Recommendations and Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Association of International Education Administrators, Carbondale, IL. |
| PUB DATE | Aug 95 |
| NOTE | 47p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | AIEA Secretariat, Bryan Hall 206, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-5120 ($3). |
| PUB TYPE | Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC02 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Agenda Setting; College Administration; College Programs; Conferences; Educational Research; Faculty Development; Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; *International Education; International Educational Exchange; Outreach Programs; Research Methodology; Research Needs; Staff Development |
| IDENTIFIERS | Association of International Education Admin |

ABSTRACT

This report provides recommendations for a research agenda designed to further internationalize higher education in the United States. It is based on a two-day meeting of a working group convened by the Association of International Education Administrators. Nearly 40 professionals knowledgeable about the field engaged in group discussions related to faculty and specialist development, university management, undergraduate programs, and outreach and extension. The working group then examined the types of research necessary for the further internationalization of U.S. higher education, including the development of data banks and other statistical information, specific surveys on emerging trends, impact studies and evaluations, and in-depth, social science-based examinations of a topic over the course of several years. It also considered research topics and priorities, including: (1) future private and public sector needs; (2) current status of internationalization; and (3) connecting current status to future national needs. Three appendixes provide a list of invited participants and the working group paper, and a bibliography of 19 titles. (MDM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 392 331

ASSOCIATION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

# A RESEARCH AGENDA FOR THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Association of International Education Administrators
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS WORKING GROUP BASED ON THE AUGUST 10-11, 1995 MEETING IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

HE028919



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*With the compliments of the*
ASSOCIATION OF INTERNATIONAL
EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

# A RESEARCH AGENDA FOR THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

1

ASSOCIATION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS WORKING GROUP
BARBARA B. BURN AND RALPH H. SMUCKLER
CO-CHAIRS

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT BASED ON AUGUST 10-11, 1995 MEETING WASHINGTON, D.C.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In behalf of the Association of International Education Administrators, we wish to communicate our deep appreciation to the Center for International Education of the U.S. Department of Education for its support of the AIEA Working Group on a Research Agenda for the Internationalization of higher Education. Our special thanks go to Richard Scarfo, Director of the Center. We greatly appreciate positive response to our proposal to convene a small number of experienced scholars and administrators to recommend on the research needed to guide and support the internationalization of higher education, and the appropriate role of the federal government in this area. We also thank the Center for International Education for the contributions of several of its staff to the Working Group project, especially Dr. Ann I. Schneider.

Also to be acknowledged are the institutions and organizations that supported the attendance at the August 10-11 meeting of members of their staff. Their participation underscored the importance attached to the mandate of the AIEA Working Group.

Barbara B. Burn
Co-Chair of Working Group

Ralph Smuckler
Co-Chair of Working Group

## CONTENTS


EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 4

INTRODUCTION ..... 6

THE WORKING GROUP MEETING ..... 8

- Opening Plenary ..... 9
- Subgroup A. Faculty and Specialist Development ..... 10
- Subgroup B. University Management and Funding ..... 15
- Subgroup C. Undergraduate Programs ..... 17
- Subgroup D. Outreach and Extension ..... 22

A NEW RESEARCH AGENDA ..... 25

- Types of Research ..... 26
- Research Topics and Priorities ..... 27

Appendices

- I. Working Group Participants ..... 35
- II. Working Group Paper ..... 39
- III. Bibliography ..... 41

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The internationalization of higher education is moving into a critical phase in the United States. From one perspective, the degree and character of internationalization that has been achieved over the past several decades is one of the extraordinary success stories of American colleges and universities. It has, on the one hand, expanded the knowledge and understanding of the globe within an American society that has emerged out of striking insularity, and drawn a stunning variety of students from abroad into a much richer understanding of American society, a much fuller level of scholarly achievement, and, for the many who have stayed on to contribute to this society, a striking set of contributions to American economy, society, and intellectual and scientific life.

As higher education absorbs an international dimension reflecting the needs of our time, institutions are faced with program and policy choices, with organizational and structural options, which can have vitally important affects on the rate of change and the ultimate success of the internationalization effort. University leaders are called upon to balance numerous competing factors in choosing the most cost/effective route, selecting as they must among competing alternatives in times of limited resources.

From another perspective, however, serious public policy questions are being raised about the value and importance of continued public contributions — from the federal and state governments and from private foundations — to international components of higher education. In part this reflects a predisposition, in the post-Cold War era, to withdraw from investments in the international arena in the absence of persuasive, future-oriented arguments in support of such investments. Though market forces will sustain important elements of internationalization in higher education, it is clear that public contributions will be necessary to rebuild and redirect much of that internationalization in ways that will be responsive to the needs of coming decades.

The AIEA recognizes that it has an important role to play in contributing to these public policy issues of the coming decade, and

that a diversified set of research activities is urgently needed to inform that debate. It is clear that we need more data and a stronger research base underpinning the internationalization effort. Research activities fall within several major rubrics.

1. How are international programs funded and managed in our institutions of higher education? We need not only base line information, but research on how patterns are changing. To what extent are market forces generating certain types of internationalization? How is public support for internationalization changing, in focus and amount? And what critical gaps will need to be filled in coming decades?

2. What faculty and other specialized resources are needed for effective internationalization? We need to know not only the extent to which public support has contributed to the availability of the resources we currently have, but also we need to know how the needs of the coming decades will differ from our current inventory of expertise, and what kinds of public contributions will be needed to train the appropriate faculties and specialists.

3. What programs and experiences have the most profound effect on the undergraduate attitudes and perceptions about cultural, economic and political forces in the complex world they will inherit? And on their view of their personal role and their nation's role in it? We need to know what works best. What can be done to enhance those studies and experiences which are most effective?

4. What has been and what could be the impact of the university internationalization process beyond the immediate campus? We need to understand and find the route to augment and broaden the impact in line with state and local needs and within the broader mission of most U.S. institutions of higher education

At a meeting held under the auspices of AIEA and U.S. Department of Education, on August 10 and 11, a group of leading specialists in international education focused on these four sets of issues and developed the more detailed agenda spelled out in the attached document.

## INTRODUCTION

The Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) has found a need for a better database and research to underpin efforts to strengthen the international dimension in higher education and the federal role in that effort. Many AIEA members, international education leaders at their respective universities, consider meeting this need to be a high priority. They are concerned to minimize the risk and maximize impact as they design international education programs and consider alternative strategies and uses of scarce resources. They want to be able to say what works best, what specific programs can be expected to yield, what current practices can be improved and what the appropriate role of the federal government and national organizations ought to be in this process.

AIEA has been encouraged to elaborate on the research needs by various national organizations and by government agencies, in particular the Center for International Education, U.S. Department of Education. They share a desire to know what works most effectively and what priorities to follow as funds become increasingly limited.

As a result of changes in the world in recent decades, many universities and colleges have added a sharper international and global focus to their courses and curricula, and to research and outreach programs. Surveys show that universities are increasing their movement in this direction.

At the same time, it is apparent that there are other competing priorities in higher education, both within government agencies and the universities themselves. It is increasingly clear that as the role of the nation and, therefore, of university graduates, evolves in this post-Cold War era, there are some in higher education institutions and on the national scene, who do not subscribe to the importance of the international dimension. All the more reason to provide a support base that is as factual and objective as possible. Anecdotes, persuasive as they may be in some circumstances, are not sufficient in long-term planning and policy-making.

To those involved in the field, "internationalization" takes on many forms and meanings. But as we began to form this Research Agenda, we decided that a broad and inclusive definition would be most useful.

We consider it to mean an international, comparative and/or global dimension into the educational, research, outreach and service functions of higher educational institutions. People in various disciplines and programs will define the specific content of this dimension for their own field differently, but the overall concern is to produce graduates who are well suited to the blend of international cooperation and competition which is likely to prevail in most fields in the decade ahead.

Our future university graduates—many of whom will become leaders locally or on the national scene—should understand global issues that are likely to effect their lives and careers. And they should be conscious of how their chosen profession or career interests will evolve within local, state, national and global context. Some graduates will choose international careers and will live and work internationally, but all will be influenced by and need to understand economic, social and political trends and forces extending far beyond national borders.

Universities are internationalizing their programs in a number of ways, depending on their own traditions and leadership. These include broad curriculum revision and specific course changes, changing language requirements, encouraging students to work or study in a foreign setting, and forming exchanges and linkages to facilitate student and scholar exchange with institutions abroad. Some have built up international interests through participating in special training programs and assistance projects. Some have pursued co-curricular activity and foreign student programs. A good number have introduced international studies, both discipline-based and multi-disciplinary, such as language and area studies and those focused on international problems or themes.

All of these approaches, and others not mentioned here, are known intuitively to contribute in some degree to an understanding of international forces and the global setting. Although they can be seen to be woven together at the institutional level, each has value on its own and may operate independently of the others, and may be managed by specialized professionals. Each approach has generated its own set of questions and issues, some of which may be amenable to research and systematic data collection.

The users of this Research Agenda will be the people at our universities, in foundations and other organizations, and in government agencies that are engaged in the internationalization process. They would also be the users of the products of any research and systematic data collection and analysis which results. At our universities, we would expect some faculty to define research activities related to this Agenda and to guide graduate students to thesis and dissertation research falling within it. Some agencies and organizations are already interested and will welcome AIEA's Research Agenda initiative as suggesting important issues and directions for data banks and research projects or other related activities.

As a major step toward encouraging research in this field, the AIEA, with support from the CIE, convened a Working Group of professionals in the field, each highly knowledgeable about the internationalization effort of higher education. The purpose of the Working Group, meeting on August 10-11, 1995, was to identify questions which could be the basis for a Research Agenda in this field. The following Agenda has grown out of the Working Group discussions.



## THE MEETING OF THE WORKING GROUP

Close to forty persons participated in the two-day meeting. They included current and past leaders in AIEA who are heads of the international offices at their own institutions, directors of international and area studies programs at colleges and universities across the country, senior staff from the Social Science Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies and the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC), staff from several Washington-based higher education professional associations, the director and other staff from the Center for International Education, U.S. Department of Education, and researchers experienced in higher and international education issues. The academic dean of the Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, which graciously made facilities available for the meetings, also participated. Appendix I lists the participants.

The conference co-chairs, Barbara B. Burn and Ralph H. Smuckler, both former presidents of AIEA, prepared a background paper and a proposed schedule for the two-day meeting. They are Appendix II.

The schedule divided participants into four sub-groups, based on their own choices, each focusing on issues relating to a broad area of international education. This section of the report follows the four sub-group/subject organization. The sub-groups focused on the following areas:

Sub-group A: Faculty and Specialist Development
Sub-group B: University Management and Funding Questions
Sub-group C: Undergraduate Programs
Sub-group D: Outreach and Extension

Opening Plenary

Richard Scarfo, Director of the Center for International Education (CIE) at the U.S. Department of Education, welcomed the participants. He emphasized the importance of the Working Group's task and commitment of CIE/DoE to clarifying and documenting the appropriate role of the federal government vis-à-vis international education in American higher education. In this connection he noted that CIE is sharping the criteria for federal support of Title VI National Resource Centers (NRC) and Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowship Programs, and needs as much data as possible on the productivity and program outreach for all CIE programs. Scarfo noted that under its International Research and Studies program Title VI is now funding a major research project by the NFLC on foreign language needs and a study by the Educational Testing Services (ETS) on the employment of 1985 and later Ph.D.s who were Foreign Language and Areas Studies (FLAS) fellowship recipients. Other significant research proposals that could similarly apply for this funding, for example, on the impacts of Title VI Centers and FLAS fellowships on meeting national needs for international expertise; the Working Group's recommendations could help CIE in setting priorities for its research program.

The subsequent discussion quickly raised the issue of long-term vs. short-term needs for research relating to the federal role. Making a case for the federal role was seen as an immediate concern by some participants because of the tightening of federal funding. If it should shrink significantly in the near future, prospects for a longer future, when research results might be put to use, are dim.

A fundamental understanding of the Working Group in seeking to identify research was that any definition of the appropriate federal role in international education should reflect and respond to the enormous changes in the international and national environment in recent years and should anticipate likely future changes. The simplistic view that the end of the Cold War has reduced the need for the U.S. to have a knowledge of the rest of the world because its polarization into friends needing wooing and enemies requiring resistance, is clearly not logical. The priority to knowledge of other countries as friend or foe, which generated the National Defense Education Act of 1958, does not resonate in a post-Cold War world.

In the view of the Working Group, the post-Cold War situation has made global and/or international knowledge even more important. The world today and into the 21st century is much bigger, more complex, more stridently pluralistic and more dangerous. We are faced with the continued availability of weapons of mass destruction, the boiling up of ethnic rivalries, the worldwide crisis of refugees, the speed of information exchange, immigration issues and the spiraling problems of population, hunger, public health, and of pollution, and the fact that either the U.S. or any other nation can make a difference on these issues. It is in this context that the Working Group came to grips with its task.



Major changes within the United States, some evolving, some more abrupt, make yet more compelling the need to strengthen international knowledge and competence among international affairs specialists, persons in the expanding number of internationally involved professions, and local communities and ordinary citizens. The complexity of international affairs, the escalating interdependence of the United States and global economies and countries, and the transformation of formerly national problems and issues (as they were widely perceived) into transnational arena requires increased international knowledge. Because this increased knowledge is profoundly in the national interest, the federal government should play a role in encouraging and ensuring appropriate access to it. The following sub-group reports have been edited to reduce duplication.

Sub-group A: Faculty and Specialist Development

Sub-group A focused on faculty and specialist development from the points of view of national need, impacts of federally supported

specialists training programs, and changes affecting the demand for specialists.

1) National need:

What is the national need for cross-cultural, international, and linguistic expertise? How can the need for specialists, in both the public and private sectors, be demonstrated? What are the characteristics of the future environment that are changing the definition of the national need? What new or modified skills in the labor force are required to meet national needs as a result of the internationalization of business, commerce, law and the academic disciplines themselves? What is the appropriate federal role in maintaining the capacity of higher education to produce these skills in the labor force?

What are the national needs for foreign language and cross-cultural communications as a citizenship issue? What are the national needs for adapting, maintaining, and, where needed, expanding the base of expertise in foreign languages, cross cultural communication, and area studies? What is the appropriate role of universities and with what support from the federal government in meeting these needs? What is being or could be done by universities to improve the range of anticipated job placements and student advising?

What issues related to national needs will resonate with the public? What aspects of international education are persuasive in the public debate?

Some more specific questions related to these questions:

— What is being done to assure retention of interested faculty and students?

— What languages would cease to be taught without federal support and with what effects?

— What has been the impact in a number of political crises over the past decade (Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia-Herzogovina) of not having enough relevant area and/or linguistic expertise or sufficient capacity to teach it?

— Are there now experts whom the nation could call upon to provide cultural, political, and linguistical guidance to our military and civilian personnel coping with a crisis in, say, Myanmar in 1998?

— What are the relative competencies in language and area expertise as between Japan and the U.S., and how does the differential in those competencies relate to the trade imbalance between the two countries, i.e. what can we learn from other countries' education systems?

— What particularly exciting and effective programs have been undertaken? What are the financial needs for effective programming in both the long and short term? What funding mechanisms are most effective? Does the source of outside funds make a difference?

2) Impacts:

The Working Group recommended that the Center for International Education and higher education institutions establish mechanisms for collecting data for all federally-supported international education programs, and that individual researchers/groups undertake studies measuring their impacts, especially the Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs. Suggested issues, some of immediate importance, some longer-term, include:

a) What are the programs supposed to accomplish, what is their relationship to national need, and what are they actually doing? Are they meeting the national needs mentioned earlier? How can this be documented?

b) Where do program graduates go and what employment do they obtain. While the ETS project will survey the initial employment of FLAS recipients based on the National Research Council's annual surveys since 1985 of earned doctorates what has been their employment situation five and ten years later after their initial employment?

c) How many international and area specialists at U.S. colleges and universities are products of National Resource Centers, were former FLAS fellowship or Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad (DDRA) recipients, or participated in Group Projects Abroad (GPA) projects?

d) How are visiting faculty being used? How are universities making good use of faculty international expertise?

e) In what ways do Language and Area Studies programs now interface with professional school programs? How many FLAS fellowships have been awarded in professional schools? And which kinds of professional schools? How is information on FLAS fellowships disseminated to professional schools? While raw data relevant to some of these questions are available in CIE, systematic analysis of the issues could be very informative. What does experience tell us about effective improvements in language study? How are language programs and area and international studies productively linked in the training of specialists?

f) In what disciplines are area studies represented? Are there gaps? In which disciplines/areas do we need more specialists? Research on these questions could draw on information from the area studies and professional associations; what do their membership surveys show about projected generational change? What is needed to train an area or international studies specialist? What is the impact of OUTREACH programs, for example, number of media bits, government contacts, non-governmental organization (NGO) and business activities, number of teachers involved in outreach programs, K-12 curriculum development?

g) What happens to colleges and universities which have had Title VI funding, but are no longer receiving those funds? As well as to the undergraduate programs which received Title VI seed money and the Title VI Business and International Education (BIE) programs?

h) What have been the effects of "lost" Title VI funding on administrative support within the institution and on external funding?

i) Over time what has been the impact of courses that have been developed at former NRCs, and at former undergraduate, BIE, and CIBER programs: what have been the enrollments? Are the courses still offered?

j) What has happened to faculty who have been trained through Title VI and/or Fulbright-Hays programs: are they teaching international language or area courses? Have they had the opportunity for further/maintenance training?

k) Are any of the Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs) entirely dependent on federal support?

l) Analyze the budgets of the institutional grant programs; survey NRCs, CIBERs, BIEs and the undergraduate international studies programs.

m) Does the way the programs are run/directed (via federal regulations, establishing priorities, program office procedures and practices) adequately respond to national needs and to the future requirements of area, international, and language studies? How might the system be strengthened?

3) Change:

a) The problem

The character of the market for international skills has been changing and will continue to change over the coming decade. Institutions and programs in universities which are outside the traditional social science and humanities disciplines are increasingly significant players in internationalization.



Funding outside the traditional areas should come increasingly from the market, but there remains the significance of the public good characteristic of basic area studies, which is impossible to marketize because of the long lead times in training and because of the extreme diffusion of areas that need to be studied. The many smaller areas may never get on the priority lists of those with market interests.

b) Approach

- Map the broadened definition of international studies as applied at universities. Identify exemplary international studies activities that demonstrate the adaptation of academic institutions to current and projected needs, and that demonstrate the potential utility of area training to new environments and challenges.
- Look at international faculties within business, law, public health, environment, engineering, etc., programs to identify backgrounds and success.
- Look at intellectual student generations of exemplary leaders in key fields for such nations/areas as japan, Ruwanda, Ukraine, Czech Republic, NAFTA (Mexico/Canada), and the Persian Gulf.
- Trace the generational impact of specific programs, such as NRCs' teacher training for community colleges and secondary schools.

- Look at the internationalization of communication within scholarly communities or scholars' interaction with practitioners?

c) Research design

- Identify a set of universities with varying levels of internationalization in four or five key professional schools. Carry out comparative analysis of the international output within professions across universities.
- Relate the character of training of intentional faculty to the links of professional programs with area studies programs, perhaps giving particular attention to NRCs, CIBERs, and other international programs, and to linkages with colleagues and institutions abroad, modes of communication, etc.
- For a set of the departments and programs in universities included in either of the two preceding designs, analyze levels, shares, and program emphasis. This can and needs to be done very quickly, to help with development of funding priorities.



Sub-group B: University Management and Funding Questions

Sub-group B reached consensus on the following.

a. Any study and analysis of possible research that would address university management and funding questions must be done against the backdrop of the complex and changing typography of higher education institutions in the U.S. and probably abroad as well. It should take advantage of and build on the work of other organizations and associations. For example, OECD's studies of the internationalization of higher education can contribute to determining what organizational models produce the most effective outcomes for the internationalization of an institution.

b. Research and data collection on the management and funding of international education should take into account that both management and funding are closely linked to technological changes and virtually all aspects of academic life.

c. The central question in focusing on management and funding questions is how they might strengthen the education of students.

d. Any research directed at identifying what organizational structure or structures most successfully foster and strengthen international education should study a variety of models and evaluate their relative contribution in productivity, cost effectiveness, leveraging of funding and the like. Research/data collection should investigate the relative pros and cons, for example, of having a single administrator at universities with more than one Title VI Center to handle fellowships, outreach, and other shared or common functions. In this research the widely assumed trend for international administration to be moving towards the center of institutional structures and priorities should be examined.

e. In assessing management of international education, research projects should grapple with basic questions: What kinds of organizational structures foster international education on various campuses? What constitutes effective leadership on the part of the key campus administrators? What should be the role of the president, chief academic officer, deans and department heads? What constitutes the process of institutionalization of area and international studies programs? Case studies could illuminate these questions, including the extent to which university leaders in a cross-section of institutions integrate international education into their agenda as academic leaders.



f. As international education becomes an increasing priority with professional schools and programs, is the management of international education and programs at universities adequately taking into account the need for links with these schools and with the relevant accrediting agencies, e.g. AACSB, ABET, and INCATE? Can such organizations' databases provide data for relevant analyses?

g. What has been the budgetary commitment of colleges and universities to their international involvements? Research on this should report institutions' cost sharing and matching-fund allocations in the case of grant monies from federal, private and other agencies, the institutions' direct appropriations to their international offices, and the contributions of individual colleges and departments. The latter include travel allocations, library resources, salary components, and some research and other support. What are the most effective ways to use external funding?

Related issues include:

What are state agencies' expectations for international education at our universities?

To what extent is international education a key element in the leadership function?

What happened to the Foundation funding initiatives of the 1950's and 1960's?

What are the strategies for the internationalization of an institution as reflected in the institutional plan and mission statement? What are the foreign student impacts on budget and curricula?

Sub-group C: Undergraduate Programs

Under this very broad rubric, discussion focussed on international education in the undergraduate curriculum, the contribution of foreign students at U.S. colleges and universities to the international education of undergraduates, undergraduate study and other educational experience abroad, and how to motivate and support faculty members' efforts to internationalize undergraduate programs.

Discussion on this large topic confirmed the difficulty of the task. This is a long term research challenge for which a foundation is found in Richard Lambert's 1989 International Studies and the Undergraduate and various efforts to test college students' international literacy, e.g. Thomas A. Barrows et. al., College Students' Knowledge and Beliefs: A Survey of Global Understanding (1981).

Subgroup C agreed that the following questions should be addressed:

— How much more knowledgeable are students about international economic and political forces and trends, and about other cultures and nations, when they finish compared to when they begin their undergraduate studies? What attitudinal changes relating to international/global concerns and issues have occurred?

— Do the attitudinal changes correlate with certain types of classroom, co-curricular, or living experience occurring as a result of attending the college/university?

— What are the effects of the media, specific courses, personal experiences, news events, students' age, etc. on these changes?

- How does one assess the international/global knowledge of undergraduates?
- What is global competency and how can a baseline be established from which change can be measured?

Subgroup C recommended the following approaches to research relating to undergraduate studies and curriculum.

1. Research the literature to identify useful strategies and research instruments to apply in addressing the above questions.



2. Explore possible coordination with the Council on International Educational Exchange, in collaboration with the Educational Testing Service, to identify, measure, and promote global competence and international skills, and to evaluate the potential for a complementary study. Encourage the application of these strategies and instruments, for example, by seeking foundation or other support to fund doctoral projects that adopt these instruments to assess undergraduates' international learning.

3. Because the core curriculum is a major point of impact on undergraduates, information about model general education programs should be collected and disseminated to help colleges and universities striving to strengthen the international/global dimensions of undergraduate education.

4. Any research agenda that addresses undergraduate education should include their community colleges so that interests and perspectives on international/global studies will be reflected in the results.

5. An important focus of research on undergraduate international education should be the impact of the Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program Title VI in meeting national needs at the undergraduate level. Research is needed to quantify

and document this program's contribution to undergraduates' international knowledge and interests, for example, in following international affairs, in interacting with nationals from other countries, or in choosing a career having international dimensions. What undergraduate data can be quantified to document positive program impact?

6. Related to the foregoing is the question: What components of undergraduate international education are valued in the marketplace? Research on this could be pursued in a local or regional context and could profitably encourage interaction between academics and business firms and other prospective employers.

a. FOREIGN STUDENTS

Notwithstanding the common rhetoric that foreign or international students are a major asset in internationalizing colleges and universities, relatively little use of this asset happens spontaneously. Very few institutions support significant programs to encourage undergraduate cross-cultural learning with and from foreign students. Research should investigate what exists and what elements are most conducive to good use of such an on-campus resource. This would involve data collection and case studies on model programs. Essential to this research would be obtaining input from students, foreign and U.S.

If international students are an important potential resource for international education, enrollment trends should be researched, not just in terms of the projection of recent years' numbers but through study of the factors influencing these numbers. These include the international competition in foreign student recruitment, relative costs of higher education in the competing countries, higher education developments in the major sending countries, perceptions of American higher education in other competing countries and the availability of financial support for foreign students through scholarships and, mainly at the graduate level, assistantships.

b. STUDY ABROAD AND EXCHANGES

Although considerable research has been conducted on study abroad by American students, much of the research has involved small numbers of students and a limited focus. Moreover, little of the past

research has aimed at identifying correlations between such variables as, on the one hand, impacts on foreign language competency, sensitivity and attitudes regarding other cultures, international learning generally, and career choices, and, on the other hand, the period of time abroad, formal preparation, whether the experience involved significant or only limited immersion on the host culture abroad, students' prior experience abroad, their major field, formal re-entry debriefings and other reorientation programs and the nature of their experience abroad.

Examples of the latter include formal enrollment in a foreign university, an independent study arrangement, work abroad and internship, and participation in an American program in which the American students learn with and often, share cocurricular board and room arrangements with other American students. Research should also take into account that the nature of American students' experience abroad seems increasingly related to the comparative economic development of the host countries/regions, in which they study.



The Group identified a range of issues and topics on which research could contribute to improvement in study abroad and exchange programs:

1. Is the profile of American students, especially undergraduates, who study abroad, changing and in what ways? Is it still predominantly female students in the social sciences/humanities fields, are males becoming more interested in overseas experience? Are majors/graduate students in such professional fields as business, engineering, health, etc. participating at any significant level (over 5%) and why?

2. Does the experience of U.S. study abroad students contribute to the internationalization of their colleges/universities? In what ways? Through what strategies?

3. Is study abroad integrated into the undergraduate curriculum/major, and if so, through what approaches?

4. What are the institutional obstacles to undergraduate study abroad?

5. A concise survey instrument with a standard format is needed to help address many of the above questions. Several key universities should be recruited to administer the survey and report its results so

that they can be aggregated, distributed, and used in a variety of settings to stimulate more research. Over time this would permit a refinement of policies and procedures in support of study abroad.

6. Because little is known about the cross-cultural learning that takes place when students participate in internships, work, or volunteer activities abroad, research is needed to identify the contribution of this experience to students' learning about other countries and cultures and their languages.

7. How much competence should students have in their host country's language prior to study abroad in order to ensure effective learning abroad?

8. What is the profile of colleges and universities that are active in study abroad and what factors contribute to their activity? Size of enrollment, characteristics of students, type of institution (size, private/public, high proportion of faculty with international experience, etc.), history and traditions of the institution, strong commitment of institutional leaders, and the like.

9. A clearinghouse or data bank on current research on study abroad, should be established. This would help guide and suggest directions for future research that would expand and fill gaps in knowledge of this important field.

10. In coordinating with the College Placement Council, a standard format should be developed for campus Career Planning and Placement offices. This could be very useful in tracking undergraduates in a systematic manner to gather information on and evaluate the link between international experiences, including study abroad, and career choice, job placement, and professional advancement.

c. THE ROLE AND COMMITMENT OF FACULTY

Central to the vitality and scope of undergraduate international studies is the commitment of faculty. Group C urged research and dissemination projects to target what most influences faculty priorities. Among possible topics are the following:

1. Because institutional "rhetoric" often pays only lipservice to an international education priority that frequently is not born out in institutional promotion and tenure policies and practices (which consequently discourages faculty from increasing their contribution to undergraduate international education), model promotion and tenure policy statements which give emphasis to international and undergraduate activity should be identified, collected, and widely disseminated.

2. In a similar vein, because department heads and deans are key to encouraging faculty to develop their international interests, pertinent research should explore how most effectively to encourage deans and department heads to provide leadership to the internationalization process. Exemplary faculty development plans should be identified, collected, and widely disseminated.

3. A useful model for assessing faculty international development is the 1992 survey by the Council on International Exchange of Scholars of the impact of experience abroad on Fulbright scholar returnees' internationalizing their teaching. The impact was significant in terms of quantifiable measures such as adding international content to existing courses, developing new international courses and personally encouraging international exchanges of students and scholars at their institution.



4. Other pertinent research might ask:

— What effects, educationally, culturally, and/or economically, have a given university's faculty exchanges at a given university or sampling of them had on their surrounding communities and state?

— How have the exchange programs of a sampling of universities furthered long-term American interests, e.g. in the development of civic culture and market economies, more open educational systems and media in the U.S. universities partner countries abroad?

Sub-group D: Outreach and Extension

This group's wide mandate promoted consideration of many elements within it: K-12 program and teacher training, citizen education, professional training and development, implementation of new technology, collaboration with business and industry, focus

on minorities, on the media, and government at all levels, and on international foreign students and institutions. Typical of the latter are agricultural development programs in developing countries which benefit the U.S. by making possible research and related activity that recognizes and advances U.S. research in the field concerned. Among the many areas relevant to Sub-group D's mandate, it focussed on the outreach of higher education institutions and internationalization efforts. The group constructed a matrix to reflect clients, methods, and impacts. Methods and impacts and their agents were deemed to involve the most urgent research needs.

Among the outreach methods noted by Subgroup D were continuing education for teachers, K-12 and post-secondary and others, distance education, collaborative research, information resource centers, business development workshops, public issues forums, cultural events, technical assistance, professional networking, and publications. Outreach through the Internet was alluded to but not discussed in any detail.



Five questions were identified to guide research:

— To what extent has U.S. university research activity undertaken collaboratively with foreign nationals led to specific breakthroughs of value to them and the U.S.?

— What impact do the international education activities of U.S. higher education institutions have on the knowledge and awareness of the nature, values, and uses of international education on the part of public officials, local, state and federal? Do public officials know about international exchanges, studies, etc. in their community or district?

— What impacts has university activity of an international nature had on the K-12 community?

— The importance of the federal government's role in supporting international education outreach should be illuminated by research on the outreach activities of Title VI centers, showing data on participation rates in each kind of outreach activity and, when possible, the longer term impact on curriculum development at all levels and career choices of students affected. The extent to which these centers

have been able to leverage their federal funds to expand their resources, and the impact of a decrease or termination of federal funding on the center's outreach activities would also be useful research topics.

— Related to the foregoing, in depth research on the contribution of the Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad and Seminars Abroad Projects to international education in K-12 and community college programs and the possible impact of cutbacks in federal funding on these programs could provide additional important information and insights on the federal role in international education. Data on participation rates and the nature of participants' follow-up activities would be very useful.

— Because Title VI mandates that the Centers for International Business Education and Research and the Business and International Education Programs collaborate with business firms engaged in international economic activity to enable them to expand become more active internationally, an important research project would be to assess this collaboration and its role in enabling American business to expand its capacity to do business abroad. Related to this, are there trends in the global marketplace that are — or could be — stimulating business to provide more support for international education at American colleges and universities?

Other research topics related to outreach and extension activity included:

— Analysis of data in the career opportunities of foreign students after their return to their home countries;

— Review and analysis of the types of linkages between U.S. and foreign institutions regarding which are the most effective in strengthening the international component in American education; and

— Survey of the various types of outreach activity and how their funding can be made yet more effectively funded.

## A NEW RESEARCH AGENDA

The reader will understand that working group discussions framed a wide range of critically important questions. They were diverse in focus, frequently framed in normative terms, and inevitably redundant. We are drawing on these questions and the research suggestions rooted in them to propose a Research Agenda which, if pursued successfully over the years ahead, would make national and institutional efforts to internationalize higher education more effective.

The research products and objectively collected data would be important to institutional leaders and to those in government and other organizations making decisions on new programs and resource allocations. It would provide the factual base and guidance for new programs yet to be established and the objective and factual support for on-going programs which are worth continued attention.

Although some members of the Working Group made a strong case for meeting short term data needs quickly, the Agenda we are proposing, primarily addresses longer term needs for data collection, impact analyses, and research. The two—short term and long term—cannot be easily separated and it is probably not productive to try to do so. Our long term Agenda provide some guidance to meet short term needs just as moving through the short term effort will suggest questions and lines of research for longer term attention. However, given the growing continuing importance of international education, we believe it would be insufficient, and perhaps too simplistic, to examine only immediate needs.

By adopting a five to ten year research perspective, which we consider to be "longer" term, we are encouraging professionals in the field to look to the future and not to focus only on short term, immediate crises. Most important, the longer term view would improve our ability to make the right program choices along the way and to better defend the successful policies and program choices now being pursued.

We are well aware that there is already a substantial data and research base underpinning various endeavors in the international education field. Our broad purpose is to expand that base, encourage those in the field to add objectivity and precision to existing

evaluations and studies and, above all, to foster the evolution of a more widespread concern about research needs among professionals in a variety of fields.

Working Group participants have generated a wide range of important questions to be examined to determine which are researchable, which are high priority, and which can be subsumed within others. Their very diversity suggests that we should define research broadly as we proceed to suggest an actual Agenda for the field as a whole.

## A. TYPES OF RESEARCH

What types of research and data collection fall within our Agenda in this field? **Category One** consists of the creation of **data banks**, regularly and systematically collected statistics and related information which can be published annually and be generally available for the use of professionals in the field. As a part of this category we would include sustained and careful collection of data and experiences which may be analyzed and used for research studies or reports and which would be available in one place and easily accessible.



**Category Two** includes **specific surveys** which shed light systematically on trends within the field as a whole, on specific problems or issues, or the views of those involved. In this category would fall surveys of knowledge, attitudes, practices and outcomes, which include general surveys nationally and institutionally, and the inclusion of relevant international education questions in larger studies.

**The Third Category** is somewhat narrower, consisting of **impact studies and evaluations** of specific activity or programs. We would include analyses of costs and benefits in this category as well as comparisons of the cost-effectiveness of programs which have similar purposes. This grouping also includes case studies which, if carefully done and reflecting commonly accepted definitions and data categories, can help to build a level of understanding of how to proceed in the field, particularly at the institutional level.

Much more could be known about current efforts and their promise for the future if we could more easily aggregate data about impact of current programs and experimental programs as they proceed. Standardization of evaluation and impact units would facilitate aggregation and comparison. Such standardization could be applied to various program elements within the array of activities making up international education—institutional linkages, exchange programs, curricular change, etc.

**The fourth category** is perhaps the most difficult, but may be the most important over the long run. It is the in-depth, **social science-based exploration** of an important topic over a number of years. It would apply as the appropriate approach to a number of the Agenda items and is related closely to several other categories. For example, long term behavioral science attention is needed for studies of the relative influence of course work, study abroad, the media, and other factors in shaping the international sensitivity, interest and knowledge level of undergraduates. We clearly need more attention to this field by behavioral scientists.



## B. RESEARCH TOPICS AND PRIORITIES

We believe the Research Agenda as derived from the Working Group discussion can be seen best as falling into three parts: I.) Research pointing to more precise understanding of future public and private sector needs, II.) Research leading to clear understanding of the current status of internationalization, and III.) Studies clarifying the best paths from this current status to future needs. The following paragraphs classify and re-state questions which arose within the Working groups:

I. **Future Private and Public Sector Needs**. Working Group discussions place a high value on studies which will provide a better sense of future national needs in the new global context. It includes consideration of predictable needs as evidence in various sectors of the economy and society at all levels.

1. As we attempt to envision the evolving global setting and trends within it which impact on the U.S., what will be the predictable need for specialists in foreign area knowledge, languages, international substantive fields? What needs will exist in government, higher

education, the private sector and non-governmental organizations at various levels?

When broken into component parts, this large set of questions may be both the most important and, at the same time, the least amenable to an objective, research-based set of answers. No one can predict the future with certainty, but there are ways of estimating what needs are likely. For example, surveys of thoughtful and knowledgeable people—i.e. leaders in industry, government and other sectors—would be of value. Studies of the patterns of supply and demand experienced in other industrialized societies would be useful. Collection of data related to important trends affecting the field would be essential.

2. Within the same and alternative visions of the future, what will be the international knowledge and language needs of the citizenry generally? What will they need to know about the world in order to deal with the public, local, state and national issues which will become increasingly important to them in their daily lives and careers? What are they likely to be called upon to know and understand, and at what levels of sophistication? In other words, what will "global competency" require and how do we measure it?



Here, too, the questions are critically important, but the methods available to find objective answers are limited. Though they are only partially researchable, their importance justifies using the best that may be available as in the first item immediately above.

3. What do various "publics" -- business, state and national governments, employers, community leaders — expect graduates of universities to know about the world, about this nation's international relations and interests, and about other cultures, etc?

These are researchable questions and part of the response we would gain as we proceed on the two immediately above, but it has value in its own right. Furthermore, a series of micro-studies addressing this basic question would provide valuable insight and guidance to professionals in the field. Closely related to it is the important question of how various segments of the public view present international education programs.

4. In view of the apparent upsurge in English language usage and prominence in international circles, under what circumstances and

in what ways is knowledge of foreign languages likely to be important to U.S. university graduates? This question, or variations of it, should be examined in a number of circles—governmental, commercial and business, literary, etc. and as much as possible should avoid the anecdotal.

As with others in this first group, this question deals with predictions of future needs and is not easily approached objectively. But some types of surveys are possible and carefully drawn collections of actual experiences would shed useful light. Certainly, questions about language instruction at various levels of the curriculum continue to be important and are likely to continue to be the center of debate in discussions of university curriculum revision.

**II. Current Status of Internationalization.** The second group of items on the agenda would inform professionals in the field about the current situation regarding a number of important lines of activity tied to internationalization. Some of them would provide basis lines against which to measure progress.



1. A number of questions would take stock of the extent to which an international dimension now exists in higher education, at universities and at community colleges:

a) To what extent do the various professions now include an international dimension within their educational programs—degree and non-degree?

b) What do current institutional mission statements in various segments of higher education say about global and international commitment?

c) Regarding accreditation, what are current international education requirements, both institution-wide and in professional schools, as now stated and practiced?

d) What is the current status of international dimension within university core curriculum requirements?

2. A number of questions would establish objective understanding of the funding of internationalization as it is now occurring at universities and two year community colleges.

a) Including international and external sources, how do universities now fund and support the elements of their internationalization efforts?

b) What revenues have been gained by universities as a result of their international education efforts, including services rendered at home and abroad to governments and the private sector and from what sources?

c) How does the fund-leveraging experience in university international education programs compare to parallel experiences in other fields? What are the main elements involved in this leveraging?

3. Research is needed to establish better understanding of what has been happening to individual students and faculty who have had an immersion experience in a higher education institution or program abroad.

a) What do tenure and promotion and merit increase evaluation forms and procedures show about the importance of the international competence or involvement of individual faculty members?

b) What is the link between international K-12 instruction, general education requirements and experience abroad, on the one hand and career choices, including job placement, on the other? Closely related, what has been the impact of different forms of overseas and international education experiences on U.S. students—internships, exchanges, study abroad, etc.— in terms of careers?

c) What are the factors currently impacting faculty mobility as it effects involvement in international programs?

d) What are the career paths of foreign students after they return home? To what extent do they have continued contact with U.S. institutions, students, and faculty, and how do these links impact U.S. education?

**III. Connecting Current Status to Future National Needs.** In addition to suggesting research activity which would estimate national needs and which would measure our current status of internationalization, the working group also suggested a number of

researchable questions which would strengthen future strategies by connecting current status to estimates of future national needs. These take the form of questions about the impact of present strategies and the data which could lead to new approaches or reinforce existing avenues.

1. A number of questions cover the impact, and broader effect of programs funded by The Department of Education, Title VI.

a) What have been the impacts of Title VI programs on undergraduate and graduate level education, both directly and indirectly?

b) What has been the impact of Title VI programs, both on-going and discontinued programs, on the broader university program?

c) In what ways are the Title VI programs responding to changes in the world that have occurred in recent years?

d) Since area and language study programs are the essence of Title VI National Resource Centers what effect has this approach to knowledge had on institutions which have not had NRC grants? What happens to the international dimension at institutions that do not have funded area studies programs.

e) What has happened to NRC graduates, and to their students?

f) While the ETS study mentioned earlier will provide information on the first jobs of new recipients, what have been their long term career experiences? If the fellowship holder went on to teaching, what have been the career experiences of his/her students?

2. A number of issues pertain to the broader societal impact of internationalization of higher education.

a) What is the impact of higher educations' international focus on K-12 education? This includes consideration of the teaching profession generally, Schools of Education and the public and private school setting.

b) What has been the impact, if any, on local, state, and national officials of university internationalization activities?

c) What has been the feedback into U.S. science and technology programs of university scientific cooperation internationally, including foreign scholars and students involved in U.S. science programs?

d) Have university internationalization efforts had an impact on universities themselves and on university administration? For example, on adoption of matrix organization models management, multi-disciplinary program management, development patterns of problem focused centers?

3. What is the relative effectiveness of various organizational approaches to internationalization under varying differing traditions and circumstances?

Some believe that there are significant advantages to a central office (in various forms) for building and managing an institution's internationalization effort. Clearly, this may not work well in all cases. What factors are most important in determining the most cost-effective management model? Systematic case studies may well be a productive way to approach these questions. Another may be to include the right questions in individual institutional research and data collections.



4. What is the relative cost-effectiveness of various models to meet the nation's needs for language skills? Depending on determination of national needs in foreign language skills, there are various ways of meeting these needs, each with costs and o outcomes. An examination of current models could serve well as approaches to meet future needs are considered.

a) What have been the most successful and cost-effective ways to maintain faculty area and language skills once such skills have been attained?

b) Do modern communications technologies offer relatively unused, potentially effective opportunities?

5. Do the National Resource Centers and Centers of International Studies and Foreign Language Programs, and Centers of International Business Education and Research offer possible models for other segments of the university community seeking to internationalize?

a) What are the strengths and weaknesses experienced in establishing and operating these models and how do costs compare to benefits at individual institutions and nationally?

**Related Items And Next Steps**

During the course of discussions several suggestions were made which would add to the value of the expanded attention to research. They are not part of the Agenda as such, but would augment the usefulness of research in the field and its practical value. They are as follows:

1. As research and systematic data collection expands, we must improve communications in the field so that results of specific studies become known and are used. Several ways to do this were mentioned. One would be a periodic conference, or a portion of the various association meetings each year being devoted to the consideration of the years on-going research and new findings. A second possibility would be to devote a section of the AIEA journal, the International Education Forum, to reports of research studies, including thesis and dissertations. Other journals might also be encouraged in this direction. (It was noted that no central place for publication on international education now exists.)

2. There should be a sustained effort on the part of professionals in the field to increase the number of international education questions included in surveys which are generally focused on related topics. Piggy-backing such questions would be a cost-effective way to provide new information and useful data.

3. AIEA members and other professionals in the field may wish to approach their individual institutional research and data-collection office in order to expand the international education component of new or annual institutional surveys and questionnaires. For example, many institutions annually collect information about incoming freshmen and it would not be difficult to add questions which would provide insight into the international experience and interests of the students. If this practice became standard and continued over the years it could be of immense value.

4. The field may be ready for more uniform reporting, for well defined categories of data collection which would be widely used and facilitate

comparisons and measurements of progress. One example would be definitions related to the undergraduate study abroad field. It may be possible to devise some form of index which would permit objective comparisons of the level (comprehensiveness, variety, quality, etc.) of study abroad participation by undergraduates in one school with those of another, or one field compared to another.

5. Several working group members suggested that one or more clearing houses to collect and disseminate information about on-going research in the field or segments of it, would be of great value.

6. Annual awards by AIEA (and/or others) for outstanding research in the field of international education would highlight the enhanced focus on research and its critical long term importance to the field—and the nation.

## APPENDIX I

### PERSONS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN WORKING GROUP: AN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH AGENDA

---

WORKING GROUP CO-CHAIRS

Dr. Barbara B. Burn*
Associate Provost
International Programs
University of Massachusetts

Ralph H. Smuckler*
Dean and Professor Emeritus
Michigan State University

Jean S. Aigner*
Executive Dean, International Affairs
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Elaine Al-Khawas
Vice President
American Council on Education

David J. Bachner
Dean of Global Programs
Hartwick College

David Barclay
West European Studies
Kalamazoo College

Karla VerBryck Block
Center for International Education
U.S. Department of Education

Joan Claffey
Director
Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development

Jeanne-Marie Duval
Senior Director, Educational Programs Division
NAFSA, Association of International Educators

Marcus Franda, Director
Office of International Affairs
University of Maryland

Madeleine F. Green
Vice President for International Initiatives
American Council on Education

Virginia M. Hammell
Assistant Director
Federal Relations-International Affairs
National Association of State Universities & Landgrant Colleges

Stanley Heginbotham
Vice President
Social Science Research Council

James B. Henson
Director, International Programs
Washington State University

Burkhart Holzner, Director*
University Center for International Studies
University of Pittsburgh

Harold Josephson*
Associate Vice Chancellor for International Programs
Chair, AIEA Public Policy Committee
University of North Carolina-Charlotte

Miriam Kazanjian
Coalition on International Education
American Council on Education

Richard D. Lambert
Director, Emeritus, National Foreign Language Center

Patrick Liverpool*
Vice Provost for University Outreach & International Programs
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University

David E. Maxwell, Director
National Foreign Languages Center
Johns Hopkins University

Edna L. McBreen
Assistant Provost
West Virginia University

Michael McCarry, Executive Director
The Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange

Gilbert Merkx
Director, Latin American Institute
University of New Mexico

Michael F. Metcalf
Associate Provost and Director
University of Minnesota

Uri Monson
Center for International Education
U.S. Department of Education

Edward H. Moseley
Director
Capstone International Program Center
University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa

Jody K. Olsen
Executive Director
Council for International Exchange of Scholars

Lisa Rosenberg
American Council on Education

Nancy L. Ruther
Associate Director
Yale Center for International and Area Studies
Yale University

Richard Scarfo
Director, Center for International Education
U. S. Department of Education

Ann I. Schneider
Team Leader, Title VI Centers Fellowship Programs
Center for International Education
U. S. Department of Education

Barbara Turlington
Director, Office of International Education
American Council on Education

Lewis A. Tyler
Executive Director
LASPAU (Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities)
Cambridge, Massachusetts



John G. Van de Water
Dean, International Education
Oregon State University

Sara West
Center for International Education
U.S. Department of Education

Steven Wheatley
Director of American Studies
American Council of Learned Societies

Dean Paul Wolfowitz
School of Advanced International Studies
John Hopkins University

*AIEA's National Agenda Task Force

## APPENDIX II

### Working Group to Establish An International Education Research Agenda

Many of us engaged in strengthening the internationala dimension in higher education have noted the need for morea research and data collection. We need research to provide new insight and a more solid base under policies and programs pointing toward internationalization. At universities and in government, both federal and state levels, we find questions and policy choices which are best approached from a more solid base built on research and data. For example, we need studies which will systematically document impacts and accomplishments, as well as failures, and thus go well beyond the traditional highly anecdotal which too often have lacked in depth analysis and comprehensiveness.

The internationalization process as the broad focus of the such studies would encompass the full range of activities and sub-fields within international education: foreign students and scholars, institutional linkage-building, area studies and other approaches to international studies, foreign language programs as a vehicle for internationalization, exchanges and study abroad, assistance programs as an internationalization and linkagea vehicle, collaborative research, citizen and community outreach and other programs which seek to build an international and global outlook and expertise.

The Association of International Education Administrators, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Education is scheduling a two day workshop for the purpose of developing an Agenda for systematic data collection and for research which will begin to meet the needs mentioned above. We will bring together people capable of identifying the issues in each of the major sectors and within international education, and singling out those which can be productively approached over the next five to ten years through research.

The Research Agenda, and priorities within it, would grow out of the workshop itself. The participants would take stock of existing and on-going data banks and current research efforts in various segments of the field. A few examples of questions to be considered at the outset: In the case of data banks, how could they be augmented or made more useful? What is the impact on students of some of our current overseas study and curricular efforts? What evaluative studies are needed within the component parts of the internationalizing effort,

such as faculty international professional development and theoretic or issue-oriented international studies? What specialized manpower estimates are needed? A Research Agenda resulting from the workshop should set the stage for individual researchers at many locations, some at the doctoral dissertation stage, to target portions of the Agenda which are of interest to them. It would also provide a preliminary check list of use to international education administrators as they work on international program development.

The proposed Agenda would center not on making a documented case for current international education programs, but on identifying the issues that require research and documentation in order to understand the internationalization process better. The thrust would be pragmatic rather than being heavily theoretical. Ultimately, it would yield more objectively justifiable and increasingly effective and affordable programs at our universities, in our states and on national scene.

## APPENDIX III

### PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY


Carlson, Jerry; Burn, Barbara; Useem, John and Yachimowicz, David. Study Abroad: The Experience of American Undergraduates. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1990.

Center for International Education, U.S. Department of Education: Title VI FLAS Fellowship Awards, 1991-94 (Washington, D.C.: September 15,1995).

Center for International Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1991-94 Center Graduates: Their Disciplines and Career Choices (Washington, D.C.: September 26,1995).

Developing the Global Work Force: Insights for Colleges and Corporations, A CPC Foundation/RAND Corporation Report, Bethlehem, PA: College Placement Council, March 1994.

Goldman, Louis W., King, Kay and Ruther, Nancy L., Undergraduate International Studies on the Eve of the 21st Century, Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs. Washington, DC, 1994.

Goodman, Louis W., King, Kay and Szabo, Stephen F., Professional Schools of International Affairs on the Eve of the 21st Century, Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs.

Heginbotham, Stanley J., "Shifting the Focus of International Programs," in The Chronicle of Higher Education, (Point of View), October 19, 1994, p. A68.

Heginbotham, Stanley J., "Rethinking International Scholarship: The Challenge of Transition from the Cold War era," in Items, Vol.a 48/ Numbers 2-3 (June-September 1994), New York: Social Sciencea Research Council, pp. 33-40.

Henson, James B.; Noel, Jan C.; Gillard-Byers, Thomas E.; and Marcus D. Ingle, Internationalizing U.S. Universities, A Preliminary Summary of a National Study (International Programs, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington: Occasional Paper # 7, May 1991).

Holzner, Burkart and Davydd Greenwood, "Institutional Strategies for Internationalization of Higher Education: A Report on the Institutional Policy Contexts for International Higher Education in the United States of America." A Discussion Paper prepared for thea IMHE/OECD Project on Institutional Strategies for Internationalization, April 1995.

Lambert, Richard D., International Studies and the Undergraduate (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989).

Lambert, Richard D., History and Future of HEA Title VI. NFLC Position Paper (Washington, D.C.: National Foreign Language Center, October 1991).

NCASA (National Council of Area Studies Associations), Prospects for Faculty in Area Studies, Stanford, CA 1991, (ed. Dorothy Atkinson).



Olsen, Jody K. and Steven A. Blodgett, "Secret Agents: Fulbright Faculty Return," in The International Educator, spring 1993, Washington D.C., pp.20-23.

Opper, Susan; Teichler, Ulrich and Jerry Carson with preface by Ladislav Cerych and Barbara Burn, Impacts of Study Abroad Programmes on Students and Graduates, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 1990.

Ruther, Nancy Lynn, The Role of Federal Programs in Internationalizing the United States Higher Education System From 1958-1988, doctoral dissertation, 1994.

Smith, Alan; Teichler, Ulrich and Marjik van der Wende, Editors, The International Dimension of Higher Education: Setting the Research Agenda. Proceedings of an International Research Workshop, Vienna

Strength through Wisdom: The Report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, Washington D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

U.S. Department of Education, Memorandum to Directors of Title VI National Resource Centers on 1994-95 Budgets. Washington, D.C.: Center for International Education, U.S. Department of Education, June 16, 1995.

This study was partially supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education.
This report does not reflect the views of its sponsoring organizations.

For additional copies contact the AIEA Secretariat at Washington State University, Bryan Hall 206, Pullman, Washington 99164-5120 U.S.A.
Copies available at $3.00 each. Mailing costs will be added for foreign orders.